

Tripartite to Bipartite Entanglement Transformations and Polynomial Identity Testing

Eric Chitambar^{1,*}, Runyao Duan^{2,†} and Yaoyun Shi^{3‡}

¹*Physics Department, University of Michigan, 450 Church Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1040, USA.*

²*Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China and Center for Quantum Computation and Intelligent Systems (QCIS),*

Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, University of Technology, Sydney, NSW 2007, Australia

³*Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Michigan, 2260 Hayward Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2121, USA*

(Dated: August 4, 2009)

We consider the problem of deciding if a given three-party entangled pure state can be converted, with a non-zero success probability, into a given two-party pure state through local quantum operations and classical communication. We show that this question is equivalent to the well-known computational problem of deciding if a multivariate polynomial is identically zero. Efficient randomized algorithms developed to study the latter can thus be applied to the question of tripartite to bipartite entanglement transformations.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 89.70.Eg

A basic question concerning quantum entanglement is whether it can be transformed in a particular manner. More specifically, given a multipartite system originally in some entangled state, what are the possible final states the system can realize if the only allowed quantum operations are performed locally, one subsystem at a time while assisted by global classical communication? Such protocols are called *Local Operations and Classical Communication (LOCC)*, and any LOCC transformation that yields a certain final state with just a nonzero probability is called *Stochastic LOCC (SLOCC)*. For some initial state $|\psi\rangle$ and target state $|\phi\rangle$, an SLOCC conversion between $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ is denoted as $|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{SLOCC}} |\phi\rangle$. In this Letter, we study the computational problem of deciding if $|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{SLOCC}} |\phi\rangle$ is feasible, given the classical description of $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$.

In general, deciding the feasibility of state transformations is difficult, with the challenge becoming more formidable as more parties are involved. This increase in difficulty can be made precise by using the language of computational complexity theory [1], which groups problems according to the amount of resources needed to solve them. For SLOCC transformations of *bipartite* pure states, the computational resources in deciding conversion feasibility increases polynomially in the dimension of either subsystem undergoing the transformation [2]; thus the SLOCC bipartite conversion problem belongs to the complexity class P. On the other hand, it was recently shown that the SLOCC convertibility between *tripartite* states is an NP-Hard problem, implying that no polynomial time decision algorithm exists if $P \neq NP$, where NP is a central complexity class that includes numerous naturally occurring problems not known to be in P. These results can be interpreted as a formal indication that it is generally much easier to study pure state

entanglement transformations in bipartite systems than in tripartite systems.

A natural next step is to examine a hybridization of these two transformation classes and see where the problem of tripartite to bipartite SLOCC entanglement conversions fits in the complexity spectrum. This is a subset of tripartite transformations in which Alice, Bob and Charlie initially share a three-way entangled state $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$, but they end with a state $|\phi\rangle_{AB}$ where Alice and Bob are still entangled but Charlie is completely unentangled from the other two.

In this Letter, we show that deciding tripartite to bipartite convertibility is equivalent to Polynomial Identity Testing (PIT), which is the task of determining whether two polynomials given in algebraic formulas are equivalent (or equivalently, if a polynomial is identically zero). PIT is a classical problem in theoretical computer science with many important applications, such as in perfect matching [3], multiset equality testing [4], and primality testing [5]. In particular, it is known that PIT admits a polynomial time *randomized* algorithm but is not known to have a *deterministic* polynomial time algorithm. The failure to “derandomize” the algorithm is shown [6] to arise from the difficulty of proving super-polynomial lower bounds on general computation models: if PIT is in P, then some other problems would not have an efficient algorithm. Thus PIT has been a central problem to the fundamental (and open) question if randomness is useful in computation (i.e. the BPP versus P question). The equivalence of the convertibility question to PIT implies the former also admits a randomized polynomial time algorithm, while it will remain a difficult question if it has a polynomial time algorithm. Together with the previously mentioned complexity results on other convertibility questions, those findings establish

close relationships between quantum entanglement and computational complexity theory.

In the rest of this Letter, we present the formal statement of our result and its proof. We start with the necessary notation and some observations. For a tripartite pure state $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$, Alice and Bob's joint state is described by $\rho_{AB}^\psi = \text{Tr}_C(\rho_{ABC}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{ABC})$, with a mixed state representation $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$, where $\langle e_i | e_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ and $p_i > 0$. The "subnormalized" eigenstates $\{|\tilde{e}_i\rangle = \sqrt{p_i} |e_i\rangle\}_{i=1\dots n}$ span the space $\text{supp}(\rho_{AB}^\psi)$ called the support of ρ_{AB}^ψ . An ensemble of pure states $\{|\tilde{q}_j\rangle\}_{j=1\dots t}$ satisfies $\sum_{j=1}^t |\tilde{q}_j\rangle\langle\tilde{q}_j| = \rho_{AB}^\psi$ if and only if there exists a unitary matrix $U = [u_{ij}]_{1\leq i,j\leq t}$, such that

$$|\tilde{q}_j\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n u_{ij} |\tilde{e}_i\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $|\tilde{e}_i\rangle$ is the zero vector for $i > n$ [7]. Furthermore, there is a one-to-one correspondence between a measurement of Charlie consisting of rank-one measure operators and a unitary matrix U that defines the resultant pure state ensemble through Eq. (1) shared by Alice and Bob following Charlie's measurement.

A consequence of these facts is contained in the following theorem whose statement requires one final bit of terminology. For a bipartite pure state $|\phi\rangle$, its *Schmidt rank* refers to the minimum number of product states needed to express it and is denoted by $\text{rk}(|\phi\rangle)$. Equivalently, for arbitrary bases $\{|i\rangle_A\}_{i=1\dots d_A}$ and $\{|i\rangle_B\}_{i=1\dots d_B}$ of H_A and H_B respectively, $|\phi\rangle$ can be uniquely identified with a $d_B \times d_A$ matrix Φ mapping H_A to H_B by $|\phi\rangle = (I \otimes \Phi) \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} |i\rangle_A |i\rangle_B$, and $\text{rk}(|\phi\rangle)$ equals the matrix rank of Φ .

Theorem 1. *Let $|\phi\rangle_{AB}$ be a bipartite pure state with Schmidt rank d . Then for tripartite state $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$, $|\psi\rangle_{ABC} \xrightarrow{\text{SLOCC}} |\phi\rangle_{AB}$ if and only if there exists $|\phi'\rangle_{AB} \in \text{supp}(\rho_{AB})$ such that $\text{rk}(|\phi'\rangle_{AB}) \geq d$.*

Proof. Let $|\psi\rangle_{ABC} = \sum_{i=1}^n |\tilde{e}_i\rangle_{AB} |e_i\rangle_C$ be a Schmidt decomposition of $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$. ($\Rightarrow$) If the transformation is possible, then there are linear operators A, B, C such that $A \otimes B \otimes C |\psi\rangle_{ABC} = |\phi\rangle_{AB} |0\rangle_C$ [8]. Consequently, $|\phi\rangle_{AB} = A \otimes B |\phi'\rangle$, for $|\phi'\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n (C |e_i\rangle_C) |\tilde{e}_i\rangle_{AB}$. Since $|\phi'\rangle \in \text{supp}(\rho_{AB})$ and $A \otimes B$ cannot increase the Schmidt rank of $|\phi'\rangle$, we have $\text{rk}(|\phi'\rangle) \geq d$. ($\Leftarrow$) Conversely, assume the existence of $|\phi'\rangle \in \text{supp}(\rho_{AB})$ with $\langle\phi'|\phi'\rangle = 1$ and $\text{rk}(|\phi'\rangle) \geq d$. Then $|\phi'\rangle$ has a unique representation $|\phi'\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i |\tilde{e}_i\rangle_{AB}$, for some complex numbers α_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, with $w = \sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_i|^2 \geq 1$. Let $|P\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i |e_i\rangle_C / \sqrt{w}$. If Charlie applies the projective measurement $\{|P\rangle\langle P|, I_C - |P\rangle\langle P|\}$, with probability $1/w > 0$ he observes $|P\rangle$ and Alice and Bob are left with $|\phi'\rangle$. Alice and Bob can then convert $|\phi'\rangle$ into $|\phi\rangle$ with nonzero probability because the target state's Schmidt rank is not higher [2]. $\square$

We note that the above result generalizes the already established condition of SLOCC convertibility between bipartite pure states of ref. [2]. If the initial joint state of Alice and Bob is pure then the transformation becomes $|\psi\rangle_{AB} |0\rangle_C \xrightarrow{\text{SLOCC}} |\phi\rangle_{AB}$. In this case, $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ is the only state in $\text{supp}(\rho_{AB})$ and the transformation is possible if and only if $\text{rk}(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) \geq \text{rk}(|\phi\rangle_{AB})$.

A unidirectional protocol like that described above is often called "one-shot" as Charlie's involvement consists of just making a measurement with rank-one measure operators and broadcasting the result to Alice and Bob. Hence $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$ can be converted to $|\phi\rangle_{AB}$ with a nonzero probability if and only if it can be done so by a one-shot protocol. The situation is strikingly different in the case of deterministic transformations since there exist tripartite to bipartite conversions that require bidirectional collaboration between the parties in order to occur with probability one [9].

According to Theorem 1, the problem of deciding conversion is reduced to whether a Schmidt rank d state exists in some subspace of $H_A \otimes H_B$. This question is a generalization of one sometimes referred to as Edmonds' Problem [3]: if $M(d_A, d_B)$ is the linear space of $d_B \times d_A$ matrices with complex coefficients and V is some subspace of $M(d_A, d_B)$, decide whether there exists a rank $d = \min\{d_A, d_B\}$ (i.e. full rank) matrix in V . Intuitively, one would expect that an upper bound exists on the dimension s of subspaces containing only states of rank strictly less than d . Indeed, Flanders provides the bound $s < d \cdot \max\{d_A, d_B\}$ [10, 11]. Thus,

Corollary. *If $\text{rk}(|\phi\rangle) = d$ and $\dim[\text{supp}(\rho_{AB}^\psi)] \geq d \cdot \max\{d_A, d_B\}$, then $|\psi\rangle_{ABC} \xrightarrow{\text{SLOCC}} |\phi\rangle_{AB}$.*

It requires more work when $\dim[\text{supp}(\rho_{AB}^\psi)] < d \cdot \max\{d_A, d_B\}$. As recognized by previous investigators, determining whether a matrix subspace is singular can be cast into a polynomial identity testing question [12, 13]. We generalize their approach to the subject at hand. Letting $\{\tilde{\Pi}_i\}_{i=1\dots n}$ denote the nonzero subnormalized eigenstates of ρ_{AB}^ψ in matrix form, any state in $\text{supp}(\rho_{AB}^\psi)$ can be expressed as

$$\Pi(\mathbf{u}) = u_1 \tilde{\Pi}_1 + \dots + u_n \tilde{\Pi}_n, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ is an n -dimensional complex vector. Construct the following real-valued function

$$g(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{\kappa_d} |\det(\kappa_d)|^2, \quad (3)$$

where κ_d ranges over the set of $d \times d$ sub-matrices of $\Pi(\mathbf{u})$ and $\det(\kappa_d)$ denotes the determinant of κ_d . Note that g is a nonnegative polynomial of degree no greater than $2d$ in the real variables $\{a_i, b_i\}_{i=1\dots n}$ where $u_i = a_i + ib_i$. Then deciding whether g is identically zero is the same as determining whether a Schmidt rank d state is obtainable

from $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$ since $g(\mathbf{u}) \equiv 0$ if and only if no matrix of rank at least d exists in the span of $\{\tilde{\Pi}_i\}_{i=1\dots n}$.

As mentioned above, Polynomial Identity Testing is a classic problem in theoretical computer science with many important applications [6, 13, 14]. In general, given two polynomials $f(\mathbf{x})$ and $p(\mathbf{x})$, it can always be decided if $f = p$ by multiplying out the polynomials and checking whether their coefficients match. However, the number of multiplications required for this procedure scales exponentially in the degree of the polynomials and at the present no sub-exponential deterministic algorithm is known for polynomial identity testing [14, 15].

On the other hand, if one relaxes the deterministic condition, randomized polynomial-time algorithms exist that can decide with a high probability of success [15, 16]. A standard algorithm uses the Schwartz-Zippel lemma which states that for some n -variate polynomial $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ over a field $\mathbb{K}$ and having degree no greater than d , if f is not identically zero, then $\text{Prob}[f(x'_1, \dots, x'_n) = 0] \leq \frac{d}{|X|}$ where each x'_i is independently sampled from some finite set $X \subset \mathbb{K}$. Thus, to test with success probability at least $1 - \frac{d}{|X|}$ whether a polynomial f is identically zero, one evaluates f on values chosen from set X and decides a zero identity if and only if $f(x'_1, \dots, x'_n) = 0$. Using this algorithm on the analysis of g in Eq. (3) allows for the following classification of the tripartite to bipartite conversion problem.

Theorem 2. *There exists a polynomial time randomized algorithm that, given states $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$ and $|\phi\rangle_{AB}$, decides correctly if $|\psi\rangle_{ABC} \xrightarrow{\text{SLOCC}} |\phi\rangle_{AB}$ is feasible with probability $\geq 2/3$.*

In other words, the problem of deciding tripartite to bipartite SLOCC convertibility belongs to the complexity class BPP, which consists of decision problems solvable by Bounded-error Probabilistic Polynomial time algorithms. The error probability $1/3$ can be made exponentially small by repeating the algorithm and outputting the majority of the outputs of each repetition.

The randomized algorithm described above can be used to construct an LOCC protocol that completes any feasible tripartite to bipartite transformation with nonzero probability. Charlie makes $2n$ independent samplings $a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \dots, a_n, b_n$ from the integer set $\{1, \dots, M\}$, where M is an integer larger than $2d$. Then he constructs $\mathbf{u} = (a_1 + ib_1, \dots, a_n + ib_n)$ and evaluates $g(\mathbf{u})$ in Eq. (3). If $g(\mathbf{u})$ is nonzero, the state $|P\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i |e_i\rangle$ is formed with N being the appropriate normalization factor. By the Schwartz-Zippel lemma, such a $\mathbf{u}$ can be found with success probability at least $1 - \frac{2d}{M}$ in the case that g is not identically zero, and an appropriate M can be chosen to make this probability sufficiently large. Then Charlie performs a projective measurement $\{|P\rangle\langle P|, I_C - |P\rangle\langle P|\}$, and Alice and Bob will share the unnormalized state $\Pi_{\phi'}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \tilde{\Pi}_i$

with nonzero probability when the outcome is $|P\rangle$. They will then be able to probabilistically obtain the desired target state $|\phi\rangle$ as $|\phi'\rangle$ is with Schmidt rank at least d . One drawback of the above procedure is that we need to evaluate $g(\mathbf{u})$. However, the explicit form of g is unknown and may be very complicated as we need to sum over all determinants of $d \times d$ sub-matrices of $\Pi(\mathbf{u})$. Fortunately, we can avoid evaluating $g(\mathbf{u})$ directly by checking whether the matrix rank of $\Pi(\mathbf{u})$ is larger than d , which can be done efficiently in polynomial time of n and $d_{A(B)}$.

It is interesting how the problem can be turned around by reducing any polynomial identity testing question to a decision of SLOCC convertibility. In an important work by Valiant [17] (slightly improved in [18]), he shows that any polynomial $p(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ over a field $\mathbb{K}$ of formula size e can be expressed as the determinant of some $(e+2) \times (e+2)$ matrix $\Pi_p(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ with entries in $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and the underlying field [17], and the construction of Π_p from p can be done in polynomial time. Let $\Pi_p = \Pi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \Pi_i$, where $\Pi_i \in \mathbb{K}^{(e+2) \times (e+2)}$, $0 \leq i \leq m$. We claim that $\text{span}\{\Pi_i : 0 \leq i \leq m\}$ contains a nonsingular matrix if and only if $\Pi_0 + \text{span}\{\Pi_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ does. The “only if” direction is trivial. Assume that $A = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \Pi_i$ is nonsingular. If $\alpha_0 \neq 0$, then $\Pi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_0} \Pi_i$ is nonsingular. Otherwise, for sufficiently large k , $\det(\Pi_0 + kA) > 0$. Thus $\Pi_0 + \text{span}\{\Pi_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ contains a nonsingular matrix.

To conclude the reduction, for each i , $0 \leq i \leq m$, let $|e_i\rangle$ be the bipartite state corresponding to Π_i , and $\rho_{AB} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$. Letting $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$ be a purification of ρ_{AB} and $|\phi\rangle_{AB}$ any rank n bipartite state, $p(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ is not identically zero if and only if $|\psi\rangle_{ABC} \xrightarrow{\text{SLOCC}} |\phi\rangle_{AB}$.

In conclusion, the results of this Letter help contribute to the complexity hierarchy of SLOCC pure state transformations. For bipartite transformations, the question of convertibility reduces to matrix rank calculations, which can be done in deterministic polynomial time. As seen here, for tripartite to bipartite conversions, determining feasibility is equivalent to testing the identity of a given polynomial, which can be done in randomized polynomial time, and whether or not the algorithm can be derandomized is a major open problem in theoretical computer science. For general tripartite transformations, no polynomial time algorithm (deterministic or randomized) is known, and under the common belief in complexity theory, no polynomial time algorithm exists.

The next question might be how the complexity of calculating optimal conversion probabilities compares for transformations involving a different number of parties. For bipartite pure state conversions, the problem is already known to have a polynomial-time solution [2]. It is interesting how in all these cases, abstract computational questions can be used to solve a seemingly unre-

lated physical problem of entanglement conversion and vice versa. Such results demonstrate the value of complexity theory in the study of quantum systems and reveals an important relationship between the two fields.

E. C. thanks Richard Low, Toby Cubitt and Nengkun Yu for many helpful discussions during the preparation of this Letter. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation of the United States under Awards 0347078 and 0622033. R. Duan was also partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 60702080, 60736011).

* Electronic address: echitamb@umich.edu

† Electronic address: Runyao.Duan@uts.edu.au

‡ Electronic address: shiyy@eecs.umich.edu

- [1] M. Sipser, *Introduction to the Theory of Computation* (PWS Publishing Co., 1997).
- [2] G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1046 (1999).
- [3] J. Edmonds, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards **71B**, 241 (1967).
- [4] M. Blum and S. Kannan, J. ACM **42**, 269 (1995).
- [5] M. Agrawal and S. Biswas, J. ACM **50**, 429 (2003).
- [6] V. Kabanets and R. Impagliazzo, Computational Complexity **13**, 1 (2004).
- [7] L. P. Hughston, R. Jozsa, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Lett. A **183**, 14 (1993).
- [8] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000).
- [9] G. Gour and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 062331 (2006).
- [10] H. Flanders, J. Lon. Math. Soc. **37**, 10 (1962).
- [11] T. Cubitt, A. Montanaro, and A. Winter, J. Math. Phys. **49**, 022107 (2008).
- [12] L. Gurvits, in *STOC '03: Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* (ACM, 2003).
- [13] L. Lovász, Bol. Soc. Braz. Mat. **20**, 87 (1989).
- [14] R. Motwani and P. Raghavan, *Randomized Algorithms* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- [15] S. Arora and B. Barak, *Computational Complexity: A Modern Approach* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- [16] J. T. Schwartz, J. ACM **27**, 701 (1980).
- [17] L. G. Valiant, in *STOC '79: Proceedings of the eleventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* (1979).
- [18] H. Liu and K. W. Regan, Inf. Process. Lett **100**, 233 (2006).